

Appl. No. 09/819,194  
Amdt. D dated January 20, 2004  
Reply to Office action of October 22, 2003

### REMARKS

Summarizing this amendment, claims 1, 8, 9 and 25 have been amended, while claims 2-7, 10-12, 19-24 and 26-29 remain unchanged. Thus, claims 1-12 and 19-29 are again presented for consideration.

The amendment to claim 25 should overcome the deficiency noted in page 2 of the official action, and claim 25 should now comply with 35 USC 112.

Applicant disagrees with the examiner's assessment of claims 1-12 and 19, finding within U.S. patent 3,308,845 (Bellas) every structural limitation set forth in those claims. It seems unconceivable that the "Bellas's structures inherently function as claimed" as the examiner asserts. Be that as it may, applicant is mindful of the allowance of independent claim 20, including the reasons expressed under the discussion of allowable subject matter, and in order to advance the prosecution of this application, applicant has included within independent claims 1 and 8 the limitations which the examiner identified as distinguishing claim 20 from the prior art – or at least has included very similar limitations. Thus, claims 1 and 8 should adequately distinguish applicants portable facility from the Bellas patent and other references as well. The same holds true for claims 2-7 and 19 which depend from claim 1 and claims 9-12, which depend from claim 8.

Appl. No. 09/819,194  
Amdt. D dated January 20, 2004  
Reply to Office action of October 22, 2003

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and allowance of the application  
with 23 claims – namely, claims 1-12 and 19-29 – are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Boeschstein  
Reg. No. 22,986  
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff  
& Lucchesi, L.C.  
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200  
Phone: (314) 238--2400  
Fax: (314) 238-2401  
E-mail: eboeschstein@patpro.com